## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

\_\_\_\_

ANTRELL VONICQUE BROWN,

Plaintiff, Case No. 1:21-cy-849

V. Honorable Robert J. Jonker

STATE OF MICHIGAN et al..

Defendants.

## OPINION DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS - THREE STRIKES

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action originally was filed in the Northern District of New York but was transferred to this Court on venue grounds. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 7). An earlier motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 3) was denied by the Northern District of New York for failure to properly apply for pauper status (ECF No. 6).

Because Plaintiff has filed at least three lawsuits that were dismissed as frivolous, malicious or for failure to state a claim, he is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court will order Plaintiff to pay the \$402.00 civil action filing fees applicable to those not permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis*. This fee must be paid within twenty-eight (28) days of this opinion and accompanying order. If Plaintiff fails to pay the fee, the Court will order that this case be dismissed without prejudice. Even if the case is dismissed,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The filing fee for a civil action is \$350.00. 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). The Clerk is also directed to collect a miscellaneous administrative fee of \$52.00. 28 U.S.C. § 1914(b); https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/fees/district-court-miscellaneous-fee-schedule. The miscellaneous administrative fee, however, "does not apply to applications for a writ of habeas corpus or to persons granted *in forma pauperis* status under 28 U.S.C. § 1915." *Id.* 

Plaintiff must pay the \$402.00 filing fees in accordance with *In re Alea*, 286 F.3d 378, 380–81 (6th Cir. 2002).

## **Discussion**

The Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996), which was enacted on April 26, 1996, amended the procedural rules governing a prisoner's request for the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis*. As the Sixth Circuit has stated, the PLRA was "aimed at the skyrocketing numbers of claims filed by prisoners—many of which are meritless—and the corresponding burden those filings have placed on the federal courts." *Hampton v. Hobbs*, 106 F.3d 1281, 1286 (6th Cir. 1997). For that reason, Congress created economic incentives to prompt a prisoner to "stop and think" before filing a complaint. *Id.* For example, a prisoner is liable for the civil action filing fee, and if the prisoner qualifies to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the prisoner may pay the fee through partial payments as outlined in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). The constitutionality of the fee requirements of the PLRA has been upheld by the Sixth Circuit. *Id.* at 1288.

In addition, another provision reinforces the "stop and think" aspect of the PLRA by preventing a prisoner from proceeding *in forma pauperis* when the prisoner repeatedly files meritless lawsuits. Known as the "three-strikes" rule, the provision states:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under [the section governing proceedings *in forma pauperis*] if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The statutory restriction "[i]n no event," found in § 1915(g), is express and unequivocal. The statute does allow an exception for a prisoner who is "under imminent danger of serious physical injury." The Sixth Circuit has upheld the constitutionality of the three-strikes

rule against arguments that it violates equal protection, the right of access to the courts, and due

process, and that it constitutes a bill of attainder and is ex post facto legislation. Wilson v. Yaklich,

148 F.3d 596, 604–06 (6th Cir. 1998).

Plaintiff has been an active litigant in the federal courts in Michigan. In at least

three of Plaintiff's lawsuits, the Court entered dismissals on the grounds that the cases were

frivolous, malicious, and/or failed to state a claim. See Brown v. State of Michigan et al., No. 2:20-

cv-13402 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 26, 2021) (frivolous); Brown v. Totten et al., No. 1:20-cv-755 (W.D.

Mich. Aug. 10, 2020) (frivolous); Brown v. Just Detention Internat'l et al., No. 1:20-cv-469 (W.D.

Mich. Aug. 10, 2020) (frivolous). All of Plaintiff's dismissals were entered after enactment of the

PLRA on April 26, 1996. Plaintiff also has been denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis under

the three-strikes rule on at least one prior occasion. Brown v. State of Michigan et al., No. 5:21-

cv-10531 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 15, 2021).

Moreover, Plaintiff's allegations do not fall within the "imminent danger"

exception to the three-strikes rule. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff does not allege facts showing

that he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury.

Therefore, § 1915(g) prohibits Plaintiff from proceeding in forma pauperis in this

action. Plaintiff has twenty-eight (28) days from the date of entry of this order to pay the civil

action filing fees, which total \$402.00. When Plaintiff pays his filing fees, the Court will screen

his complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c). If Plaintiff does not

pay the filing fees within the 28-day period, this case will be dismissed without prejudice, but

Plaintiff will continue to be responsible for payment of the \$402.00 filing fees.

Dated: December 2, 2021

/s/ Robert J. Jonker

ROBERT J. JONKER

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

3

## SEND REMITTANCES TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

Clerk, U.S. District Court 399 Federal Bldg. 110 Michigan St., N.W. Grand Rapids, MI 49503

All checks or other forms of payment shall be payable to "Clerk, U.S. District Court."